THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII FEBRUARY, 1954 No. 404

Editorial

WE deplore as much as anyone the persecution which Roman Catholics are undergoing in Poland and elsewhere, but when the editor of *Blackfriars* (December 1953, p. 521) says that his Church is withstanding attacks not only "on her life" but "on liberty itself" we should like to know more about what is meant. "Liberty itself" must be intended to include, in addition to the liberty of the Church, civil or constitutional liberties in general, i.e. liberty of conscience and of religion, liberty of association, liberty of the press, and educational liberty. We do not doubt the sincerity of Roman Catholics in Britain or North America when they profess a determination to stand up for these things at all cost, but we wish we could be sure that in doing so they are well-informed and dependable interpreters of the mind of the papacy. The editor of *Blackfriars* (loc. cit.) would apparently dismiss our misgivings with an unkind, and perhaps injudicious, reference to "the idiosyncrasies of certain Spanish bishops", but the question is whether the Spanish bishops have not got more papal authority behind them than the liberal-minded apologists. Dom Aelred Graham, who is very liberal-minded, suspects that critics of the papal encyclicals have not always taken the trouble to read them;[1] we suspect that we may have read some of them more recently than he has.

A juster sense of the delicacy and difficulty of this subject for Roman Catholics is shown by a group of French and Belgian Catholics who have collaborated to produce a symposium entitled *Tolérance et Communauté humaine: Chrétiens dans un monde divisé.*[2] They seek to discover theological grounds for regarding civil liberties and pluralist societies as defensible and indeed as desirable, despite the pronouncements of the nineteenth-century popes in favour of the unified Church-State as the Catholic norm. The contributors include Père Louis Bouyer, Père Yves Congar, and others: their general position is similar to that of M. Jacques Maritain, but they arrive at it from different starting-points, biblical and doctrinal as well as philosophical and political. All Christians might read these essays with advantage. Toleration made its way more from weariness with religious strife than from an understanding of how the Gospel requires it, and still many Christians believe in toleration not because they take truth seriously but because they do not take it seriously enough. The discussion in these pages of "the rights of conscience" and kindred concepts is marked by acute and sometimes masterly discrimination.

We cannot, however, be blind to the fact that there is no decisive

[1] *Catholicism and the World To-day*, p. 148.

[2] Casterman, Tournai. 84 B. frs.

evidence yet that the papacy has changed its mind on the basic question. On the contrary, *The Tablet* (14 and 21 November 1953) has lately published an English translation of an article on the new Spanish concordat by Cardinal Pla y Deniel, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, in which he rebukes two American Catholic journals for having said that the Spanish prelates are too intolerant. "Actually these prelates were loyally following the traditional doctrines of the Church, as set down by theologians and canonists, and particularly by the Roman Pontiffs themselves." The new Spanish concordat squarely says that "the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion will continue to be the sole religion of the Spanish nation and will enjoy the rights and prerogatives which are due to it in conformity with the Divine law and Canon law". "In order to avoid greater evils", says the Primate, "it is reasonable and prudent to tolerate private worship for" non-Catholics—"some of them hold their beliefs in good faith"—"but never public worship, or propaganda against the Catholic religion, because there is no rational foundation to permit this." "No public ceremonies and manifestations, other than those of the Catholic religion, will be permitted. . . . Any public meeting, any gathering in the street, any external sign of a public, non-Catholic chapel, as well as posters and so forth, must be considered public manifestations." In reply to "those who had rashly accused the Spanish prelates and theologians of living four centuries behind the times on the question of religious peace and tolerance", the Primate claims that the "doctrines of these Spanish prelates and theologians were proclaimed and reaffirmed before a great audience of eminent Cardinals, by the Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office" (Cardinal Ottaviani), "whose Prefect is the Pope himself", in a lecture on 2 March 1953, and that they are in accordance with the contemporary judgment of the Holy See concerning the right relations between Church and State "in predominantly or totally Catholic countries".[1]

We could cite other evidence to show that the Spanish Primate is not mistaken. For example, Mgr Jacques Paul Martin "de la Secrétairerie d'État de Sa Sainteté", in his book *La Nonciature de Paris*, published in 1949, says with the authority of papal pronouncements behind him that, whatever its present policy in certain countries, the Church's objection to educational liberty is a matter of principle which is valid for all times.[2]

[1] That this is so appears to be confirmed by the pope's allocution on 6 December 1953 to the National Convention of Italian Catholic Jurists (see *The Tablet*, 9 January 1954), which at the same time is concerned to point out that the obligation "to impede or repress what is erroneous and false" is not binding in all circumstances.

[2] "La liberté d'enseignement, que nous sommes habitués, sous des gouvernements plus ou moins athées, à considérer aujourd'hui comme le salut de l'éducation chrétienne et le remède souverain contre les empiètements de l'État, n'est pas en soi l'idéal. La liberté, concédée indifféremment à quiconque, d'enseigner ce qu'il veut, peut même être pleine de périls: l'erreur peut en profiter au même titre que la vérité. L'Eglise, si elle peut la tolérer dans de justes limites, ne peut la promouvoir. Cette raison de principe, qui vaut pour tous les temps . . ." Op. cit., p. 317.

The Power of Jesus is like . . .

We can hardly deny that the incarnate Christ was the greatest theologian of them all. "He spake many things in parables" (Matt. 13. 3, 34 etc.). Our theology speaks in parables hardly at all, as a glance at the index of any theological journal will show. "The common people heard him gladly" (Mark 12. 37). They do not hear us gladly.

"The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field . . . is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took . . . is like unto leaven which a woman took . . . is like unto treasure hid in a field . . . is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls . . . is like unto a net which is cast into the sea . . . Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder . . ." (Matt. 13 passim; cf. 18. 23; 20. 1; 22. 2; 25. 1).

The "scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven" who compiled the first gospel does not suggest that this particular parabolic form was Jesus Christ's only method of conveying theological truth. Nor is rigid adherence to it here commended. But let it serve to initiate discussion.

Of the two terms of the parabolic comparison the first is fixed, the second variable. This latter is some person, thing, action, or event, within the experience of his hearers. The fixed term, the kingdom of heaven, exactly fitted contemporary interests and aspirations. It might seem that he could as well have said, "the glory of God is like" or "the love of God" is like. But to a people in bondage both to the Law on the one hand and to the Roman power on the other, it was God's kingdom, his sovereignty, which needed above all to be proclaimed and interpreted. We may take it with all reverence that the term was chosen not without much prayerful consideration of contemporary needs.

Therefore "the kingdom of heaven is like . . .". But in our contemporary industrial democracy the meaning of the phrase is virtually incommunicable to the uninitiated. Kingdom, kingship, is divorced from sovereignty and power. Heaven is "my blue heaven"; or, more happily: "I'm in heaven, dancing cheek to cheek." Possibly a folk-memory survives of uncongenial harps and crowns. To say "kingdom of God" instead is hardly more intelligible. In the film version of *The Third Man* God is mentioned but once, to be casually shrugged off by the villain (or hero) as irrelevant. So Graham Greene brilliantly illustrates the fact that to millions, if God is anything, he is a remote mathematician, a benevolent mind (the concept is indeed confused) in ultimate control of the atoms and the stars.

We may more easily indicate how relevant the "kingdom of heaven" was to Christ's hearers, how difficult to communicate to-day, than suggest a proper substitute. But let us put forward and briefly justify "the power of Jesus" as our first term. The second term, as in his parables, will be variable, a gallery of persons and things, actions, and events, common to contemporary experience.

"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds In a believer's ear." Nor is the name without honour to the unbeliever. In a very large part of the world most people know at least that Jesus was a wonderfully good man. And this means something, makes sense. Studdert Kennedy would say that Christianity is betting your life that God is like Christ. He assumed that people knew or could be told what Jesus Christ is like. God is the difficult, the remote idea.

Most people know, too, what power is. Power politics, the power of money, horse-power, personal power, these are widely intelligible. No one speaks of a woman's kingdom over her household. Everyone knows what you mean by a mother's power for good.

Here a major danger of the parabolic method is revealed. Our fumbling imaginations tend anthropomorphically to assimilate the two terms. To say that the power of Jesus is like this or that may be to encourage ourselves or others to regard that power in terms of politics or physics or economics. Two facts disarm that danger. First, even that paltry acquaintance with the gospel record on which we can rely would make it very difficult so to regard the power of Jesus. Consider for instance how explicitly he rejected just such conceptions of power when tempted in the desert. Secondly, his own term, kingdom, was at least in as great a danger of debasement, what with the Herods and Tiberius; to say nothing of the zealots' yearning for a king of the Jews. He took the risk. And so must we.

Therefore take an egg, a pigeon's egg. It is hard and white, cannot move of itself. It is sealed up, there is no entrance. But soon will break out the bird, the pigeon swift and strong to quarter the earth in flight, full of life, warm-blooded. The body of Jesus lay stiff and still, white and cold after death, motionless in the tomb, sealed up, without entrance. But the power of Jesus alive is swift and strong to quarter the earth. Like a bird, like a dove, his Spirit is ready to swoop into your life, into your heart. The power of Jesus is like that.

Or it is like a blood transfusion. You are cold, shivery, on edge, though you try to ignore those feelings bravely enough. They call it shock. Then warm life-blood comes flowing through, another's blood freely and voluntarily given for your healing. You are warm, secure, confident. So the world of nations to-day is shivery, on edge, suffering from the shock of wickedness. And the blood, the life of Jesus, avails for its healing.

You've seen acorns. The tiny acorn, hard and cold, buried in the earth, food for pigs. Out of it springs the ancient power of a great oak. The body of Jesus in the tomb, under the rock, lay stiff and cold, food, it seemed, for worms. How slender, how tiny an instrument for the healing of the world. But out of that death springs the power of Jesus alive. Do you know what it is to tramp the moors for hour on thirsty hour, to come at last to the village, to rest under the great oak on the green?

The power of Jesus is like a young man on holiday close under the moors. He wakes very early one morning. He would see the sun rise over the moor. Up and out he goes, along the steep sheep track. Up there it is still dark, dreary, somehow menacing. A scurry of grouse

rise at his feet with a whirr. "Go back, go back," they seem to say. As if a spirit of the moor, hostile to the lonely traveller, cries out against the offending footstep. Go back, go back, go back.

Then the sun rises over the high shoulder of the moor. As he leaps into the sky the sullen landscape is changed, transformed. Greys and dismal browns give way to radiant green, rich tawny, deep purple where the heather clings. The clammy grass now lies like a jewelled carpet, every blade adorned with its drop of precious dew, green and blue and crimson, purple and white.

Without the power of Jesus our lives are like the moor before the sun, dark, dull, colourless, almost frightening in their meanness, their futility. He can change, transform, convert them into things of power and beauty, jewels in his crown.

Perhaps you've never seen the sun rise over the moor. Well, then, the power of Jesus is like the same young man buying himself a fancy pullover. He knows a little back-street shop. He chooses a pullover, fingers it carefully this way and that; then complains that it is so dark he can't see whether it will go with his suit. "Shall I bring it to the light, sir?" says the shopkeeper.

As his hands conveyed to his mind a judgment on the quality of the stuff, as the light declared a judgment on its colour; so the power of Jesus, the power of his goodness, declares for ever the stuff of which we are made; the power of Jesus shows us up in our true colours, judges whether we "go with" the purpose for which God made us.

But you will have had enough. There's nothing in this; a few illustrations from old sermons, loosely strung together. And even these do not speak specifically to the condition of our industrial society.

They do not. For every young man from the Liverpool-Manchester conurbation who turns aside to tramp the moors, there are a hundred who keep going, straight on for Blackpool. The present writer has not the industrial background to be desired in a contemporary maker of parables. As Jesus himself served his thirty-year apprenticeship in contemporary village society, so maybe the parable-makers of tomorrow will have been born and bred on municipal housing estates.

The illustrations are loosely strung together. Only the moor, for instance, connects the acorn and the sunrise. Here we claim the protection of the gospel record itself. The evangelists used much skill and patience in assembling the traditional material in travel narratives, blocks of teaching and the like, linking individual parables by subject matter or simply by key words. Yet the arrangement is secondary. We can seldom if ever ascribe it with confidence to Jesus himself. Any extended attempt to compose contemporary parables would indeed pay attention to grouping, but without that undue systemitization which would be foreign to the whole method. The compiler might, for instance, do well to begin with the fact of the resurrection, the starting-point of the apostolic preaching; and end on the theme of divine judgment. But there would be no systematic precision in his plan.

Lastly these are in fact but illustrations from old sermons. The charge is admitted on all three counts. Yet paradoxically enough this

admission but strengthened the present plea for the revival of the parabolic method and of its theological status. If these are but sermon illustrations, then any parish priest, any preacher with a pastoral charge, is potentially his own theologian in this field. He, if anyone, should have the necessary double sensitivity to the power of Jesus on the one hand, to the current interests and aspirations of "the common people" on the other. If these illustrations are not specifically related to contemporary industrial society, then the reader who is in closer touch with that society can and must do much better, get much nearer to both terms of the comparison! In the practice of the parabolic method as a theological discipline as well as a practical aid to preaching and teaching he may well find the necessary incentive (and it must be a compelling incentive these days) to "keep up with his reading", even widening its range in the search for second terms of comparison. Restoration of the theological status of parable as a primary means of imparting truth about God should also reduce the tension between present academic study and future parochial work for the theological student in training. For parable with its two terms bridges the gap between doctrinal study and pastoral practice. Nor is it here implied that academic specialists, professional theologians, have no place in this field. As in the fine arts and literature, it would seem that their main task would be criticism, theological criticism of parabolic comparisons, ancient and modern. But we could also expect much original work, many striking parables from their expert knowledge and trained imaginations. Let's have a chair somewhere of analogical theology!

A. H. Dammers.

"I Beheld His Glory"

The Dawn Trust had invited clergymen, ministers, and many other people, to the première of its new film *I Beheld His Glory* in the New Gallery, where it was about to be shown for one month three times a day without any charge for admission. The "New Gallery Centre" in Regent Street is a cinema which has been taken over, I understand, by some Christian organization. There is a full-time pastor, a reading room, lunch-hour organ recitals, and interdenominational services on Sundays.

A large audience gathered in this hall for the first showing of a colour film on the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord. The invitation spoke of the "most significant religious sound film of the last twenty-five years". This was repeated in the opening address by the chairman of Dawn Trust, the Rev. Brian Hession. He mentioned the beginnings of Dawn Trust and the struggle it had carried on for the religious film. He expressed gratitude for the facts that such a large audience had come to the première and that so many important persons were backing the efforts of Dawn Trust. "It is the first time that a religious full-feature film is being shown in the West End of London," Mr Hession said. He went on to mention the critical financial

position which such a venture entails. He emphasized the importance of the media of film and television for bringing Christ to the people. He asked for the prayers and support of those who had come. He spoke with great sincerity and feeling.

Then the show began. First a pictorial hymn, "Fierce raged the tempest . . .", in which we were asked to join. The film showed wild seas and waves, calm waters, storm and peace alternating, and an invisible church choir sang the hymn on the sound track. There followed the Coronation film made by Mr Hession and a band of amateurs, and at last the new film began.

This film raises many questions. Let me say at once that there can be no doubt of the single-minded intention of the producers and all their supporters, who apparently range from Roman Catholics to all kinds of Protestant denominations. Let me also say that most of us will agree that "visual aids" have rightly come to play their part in the work of Christian evangelizing. But it is precisely at this point that the question arises, how?

Mr Hession in his opening remarks made a very interesting observation using, as speakers do, the pronoun "we", when he claimed that "we all are waiting for the time when it will be possible to remove the restriction which forbids the showing of our Lord's person on the stage", or words to that effect. For Christ must be shown to the people directly! When I had seen the film (which bears, I suppose, some resemblance to the Passion Play of Oberammergau) I wondered whether there has not been great wisdom in the law which prohibits the impersonation of Christ on the English stage. Here was "the most significant religious sound film of the last twenty-five years"—and what an anticlimax it was!

I am not concerned here with the acting and with the purely technical side of the film. I am not qualified to judge that. To me it seemed that the acting was fairly good, and that certain scenes, especially those with Pilate, were very well done. I am concerned here with the theology underlying this film. The question one must put to the producers and script writers is: Did they ever consider the theology of the New Testament when they were making their film? Or are we right in suspecting that their very enthusiasm to use the modern visual aids to bring Christ to the people got the better of the producers; that they were so taken up with the question of the acting, the story, the effect, and the whole host of technical problems, that there was no time to establish some theological principles on which to proceed? In order to show what can be done I may refer to Dorothy Sayers' *The Man born to be King*. The prefaces to the twelve plays are evidence of her theological preparation and understanding of the problems involved.

Let me try to outline the main critical questions.

(1) We are rightly concerned with the presentation of the kerygma in these days. It involves all the subsidiary questions of the presentation and interpretation of the gospels. There are the historical events as recorded in the gospels. There is the interpretation of them recorded in the whole canon of the New Testament. There is the Event

of the resurrection, which is different from the historical events which preceded it. It happened within history. But the Event itself cannot be established by historical observation. It is historic, but it transcended what we call history. The empty tomb was indeed an historical observable event—but nothing more. The Event was the appearing of the Risen Christ to his disciples (1 Cor. 15). Hereby the event of the suffering and dying of Jesus was made manifest as sacrifice, conquest, and atonement. Thus the apostles became witnesses of the resurrection and their proclamation of the evangel was firmly based on this witness. There is therefore a problem which besets all religious drama and in particular any presentation of the life, death, and rising of Jesus Christ. The article on "Christmas Plays" in THEOLOGY, November 1953, made this very clear. Now, nativity plays are mostly shown to churchpeople and, like passion plays, often in a church. The audience—a majority of them, at any rate—is "conditioned" to the reception of the play because they are people who believe the evangel of the birth, dying, and rising of the Son of God. Even then it would be most important to show that the resurrection is different from the observable events of Golgotha. Miss Sayers has shown us in her broadcasting plays that this can be done.

(2) When we come to a film we are faced with a different problem, especially when it is designed to appeal to the masses of indifferent or half-believing people. For, as the producers of Dawn Trust say, "Christ must be presented to them". Exactly—Christ! But that is the difficulty, for what this film (like other worse ones before it) does is to show Jesus of Nazareth. You cannot properly "show" Christ.

The gospels were written in the Church for the Church. The great pictures of our Lord were painted by Christian men for believers. But the "man in the street", the indifferent man of these days, has no objection to Jesus, not even to his teachings. He objects to—Christ. He cannot come to terms with "Crosstianity". He cannot see why this man's life and death should touch him, and have a decisive and eternal meaning for him. Many Jews and many Gentiles could not see it when he was on earth. Now, of course, the producers of the film know this. What is their solution? They work on the feelings of the audience. They surround the film with music, nearly all the time. The film, especially some scenes, is very moving. At the end of it all the audience sings two verses of "Abide with me". But one may reflect on the fact that the kerygma as recorded both in the epistles and the Acts does very little to move people or to work on their feelings. It always appeals to their will. It addresses the whole man, it demands an existential decision (Acts 2. 38). It does not say as the Centurion says, at the end of the film, "Jesus is the hope for all mankind." This is true indeed. But to put it this way and at that moment is nothing but declamation. The unbeliever or doubter will still ask: Why?

The producers could not apparently decide what they wanted to do. They wanted to be realistic. Yet they break through their realism all the time, especially by giving the decisive scenes a musical accompaniment. That means that even in the horror of Golgotha, when we see our Lord hanging on the cross, we hear *music*! But there was no

music on Golgotha. There was stark horror and evil and death, nothing to soften it. This music is very suggestive. It appeals to the feelings, but it does not help at all. It prevents the events as they are enacted from making their full impact on the viewer.

(3) The producer tries to make the people in the film speak modern English or American. Yet nearly all the time when our Lord speaks it is "biblical" language. It sounds as if a lesson is being read in church. When the Last Supper is shown and our Lord says the Verba, my impression was much more that of seeing the Eucharist celebrated, in the early Church, than the institution of it. One may ask whether it is theologically possible, or advisable, to re-enact the Last Supper in a film or on the stage. For to the believer the true Re-enactment (not so much of the Last Supper as of the Sacrifice) is the Eucharist. To the non-believer—what does it mean? And the artificiality of the scene, however movingly acted, is heightened because the producer has modelled it on classical paintings and not on the New Testament record. First, the disciples sit on chairs; there are no couches, no reclining. Secondly, there is no supper between the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup. That alone makes the scene more like a eucharistic celebration.

(4) This question of realism is also raised by the scene of Gethsemane. Again, it seems that classical paintings were the model. Our Lord is shown in prayer. A light surrounds him. Here also the observable and the transcendental are mixed, so that it is all on the same level, it can be seen by all. What will the half-believing or non-believing viewer make of that scene?

A man prays. He makes beautiful gestures. He uses words of resignation. But many other people have done the same. One cannot "act" the agony of the Lamb of God. One cannot "show" it. To the believer this scene, and that of the crucifixion, is embarrassing, if that is the right word to describe it. If we see a great painting of the scene on Calvary or a crucifix we see an image which may stir us to devotion. But here, in the film, we see acting. It is not the acting as such which I am questioning here. It is, I believe, good acting. But will this acting of the dying of Jesus do what it claims to do? Will it bring *Christ* to the people?

Will it in those who think and do not believe perhaps raise the question: Like horrors have been suffered by people in the torture chambers of the concentration camps. Why should this Man's suffering affect me? We use, of course, in our Lenten and Holy Week devotions both thoughts and language which reflect the theology of St Bernard and the piety which centres on the sacred Humanity of our Lord. This piety is meaningful for those who accept the kerygma, although as a type it is a later development, and it dominates still much of both Roman Catholic and evangelical piety. But one may not, I suggest, make this kind of piety the basis for a film of our Lord. And if the film, which the Dawn Trust hopes to make one day of the whole life of our Lord, is of the type of the present one, it will mean that, in their zeal to produce visual aids for evangelizing, the producers of these and other religious films have, so far as their films are

concerned, never faced the questions with which biblical theology has been busy for the last twenty-five years and more.

(5) That this is so may be deduced from the last scenes of the film. The records of the resurrection in the gospels (cp. St Luke 24) reflect the apostolic witness. They are concerned with an Event which though it happened in time transcends time. What does the film make of it? That there is a real difficulty here the producers have seen. For they show great reticence in the actual scenes of the appearances where only part of the figure of Jesus can be seen and never his face. Yet the question remains? Is it possible—is it legitimate—to act the resurrection story?

And if it were—is it legitimate to do it in the way it is acted here? What Miss Sayers does in the last of her plays is a dramatizing of the gospel records where there is *no visible* acting, and where the Event is interpreted. What happens in the film? First the tomb is shown, its sealing and the guards. Then—inevitably— thunder and noise. Then the empty tomb. Here I noted that the linen cloths—the bands which were wrapped round the body—were folded together whilst the records in St John suggest that they were not folded together but lay flat. Yet this is a minor point. There are no angels shown in the scene. But Mary Magdalene sees the figure of our Lord—only part of it can be seen—and hears his voice. The same occurs in the Upper Room after eight days had gone. The figure is seen in part, Thomas is seen touching the hands and the side, and then falling down and uttering the words of St John 20. There is no attempt at any interpretation of what all this means. Moreover it appears to be on the same level as the empty tomb. The appearance of the risen Lord is observable by all, even if in fact only a few did observe it.

In his laudable zeal to proclaim the risen Christ the producer tries to make visible what is visible only to faith, and in the Upper Room the Lord speaks to Thomas the words about seeing and believing and does so in the film. After that, we see the stairs outside the Upper Room and the Centurion Cornelius on the stairs. Then we see a bit of a white garment brushing past him on the stairs. Thomas opens the door to the Roman officer and breathlessly tells him that he has just seen Jesus. Then he says: "Did you not see him?" "Where?" is the officer's reply. "He must have met you on the stairs," says Thomas. "Yes, yes, his robe must have brushed my arm," we hear the Centurion whisper in awe. It may be very moving—yet it is offensive. Is everything allowed in a film? Are all means justified by the end? Can we mix up all the events of the New Testament in that fashion? Did he who, according to the witness in St Luke and St John, stood in their midst whilst the doors were locked use the stairs? It sounds a silly question, but it has to be asked. Poetic licence is one thing, but it must be limited by certain theological considerations. It reveals a complete misunderstanding of the Event of the resurrection to show such a scene and to let a man utter those words.

And turning again to the non-believing viewer, will that convince him? Will that help him to believe in the risen Christ? Does not the film, through such a little well-meant addition, make the whole Event

a "myth"? And does it not thereby defeat its own purpose? There is —dare I say it?—something almost ridiculous about this little scene. It seems to make the whole Event cheap and quite incredible. It fastens the viewer's thought not on the Person who has overcome death but rather on his external appearance. It does *not* make it more "real". For the reality of the risen Person cannot be described in this way. It only helps to suggest unreality, the one thing which the records deny, a phantasma or ghost.

I am convinced that a film would be much more realistic and true to the records if, having presented in some way the Event of the cross, it then shows Peter proclaiming to the crowds: "We have seen him . . . we proclaim unto you. . . ." Why invent this story of the centurion when we have the story of the New Church which would give ample frame to the gospel story? This film does not show at all that this Person is the foundation of a Community, the Church, where men are called to *believe* a witness, not to see it, and where the Event of the Cross and the Resurrection is enacted in the liturgy of the People of God.

It seems as if the producers have never wrestled with the "Riddle of the New Testament" and never faced the theology of Revelation. That we can speak of it only "brokenly" and not "directly" appears not to have occurred to them.

ERNEST GORDON.

The Atheist and His Spooks

THE time has come, I feel, when a particular question requires to be discussed. Is not the attitude of the Christian apologist of to-day towards science and scientists altogether too concessive and conciliatory, too meek and obsequious? Mistakes have been made in this direction before. About a hundred years ago, if not every kind of apologist, at least the Anglican variety, resorted to tactics which, by subsequent generations, were found to have been to the detriment of the social status of the Church. The Anglican apologist tended to be too high and mighty, too confident and disdainful. The issue was the plenary and verbal inspiration of the Bible—of the Old Testament as much as of the New—and, believing that the least doubt on the subject would be fatal to salvation, he felt that the onslaught of the scientists must be repelled. Yet, lamentably underestimating the strength of the forces arrayed against him, he behaved as though they could be routed by a whiff of mockery. Hence Bishop Samuel Wilberforce's question to Huxley. The occasion was a debate during the British Association meeting at Oxford in 1860. Only the year before, in 1859, Darwin had exploded his bombshell, *On the Origin of Species*. Till the book appeared Huxley had looked askance on the theory of biological evolution. It converted him into an enthusiastic advocate. Thus in the debate the bishop was led to say: "Perhaps Mr Huxley will tell us if he claims descent from a monkey on his grandfather's side or his grandmother's side?" In the ears of the faithful at

the time the sally may have sounded devastating. It sounds the more silly in retrospect that the ecclesiastical position of 1860 has since been almost completely abandoned. Bishops and even lesser fry scoff at evolution no longer. The scientists have grown too powerful to be twitted. So anxious are clerics to manifest the broadness of their minds that they are apt to give the pulpit seal of certitude to some biological theory or other which the professional biologist has more or less discarded. Yet in the long interval since 1860 no lesson has been learned, any more than any lesson was learned from the vanity it was in 1633 to impose penance and abjuration on poor Galileo.

The danger now seems to be of committing the opposite mistake. Christians are not going forward, and the pretensions of science are not in retreat. Instead of "Onward, Christian soldiers!" the call may soon be for "unconditional surrender". Let that doctor of science and fellow of the Royal Society, Bishop E. W. Barnes, remain undisturbed in the quiet and obscurity of his retirement.[1] Others have taken up the task he began. There is, for instance, Dr Alan Richardson, who contends that theology is really as empirical and scientific as physics itself. There is Dr Karl Heim,[2] who, with Teutonic solemnity and fecundity, feels it incumbent to devise and elaborate through many a ponderous volume the theory of a second and non-polarized space in addition to the space of physical experience, so that—as Dr Oldham puts it—"a man with a mathematical and scientific training, and familiar with the causal relations of natural occurrences", can "hold the Christian faith without compromising his intellectual conscience". And there is Dr E. L. Allen, who appeared before the conference of Modern Churchmen at Oxford last September, and demanded that theology should be given a new dress. "Theology", he was reported as saying, "is too often unintelligible to those who have not acquired its peculiar language." Apparently there could be no asking such people to repair their deficiency in that respect. No: theology would have to give way to them. "We must"—Dr Allen said—"we must find a language in which to speak of God, Christ, and eternal life, to men and women whose minds have been formed by modern technology."

How the demand was received by Dr Allen's hearers I have not been told. But why confine it to theology? An inspector of taxes, for example, might well say: "Taxation is too often unintelligible to those who have not acquired its peculiar language." Why not a new language in which it would be possible to speak of income tax to "men and women whose minds have been formed" by modern art, say, or by modern theology? Where is that kind of thing likely to get us? Not very far towards making converts and filling churches. On the contrary, the effect upon masses of young men and women with

[1] Written before the regretted death of Dr Barnes.

[2] In speaking of Dr Karl Heim's work I rely on Dr Oldham's article here last July. It is the theory expounded by Dr Oldham which seems to me noxious. I shall never read Heim's books, but I have looked at one in translation, and I think it only fair to say that he is evidently a highly gifted writer, amiable, clear, persuasive, and interminable.

the scientific outlook will more probably be that they will stay outside the Church for ever. I go on to indicate why.

If the relations of religion and science were being discussed a hundred years ago, so they were also fifty to sixty years ago. But "nowadays the so-called 'conflict between Religion and Science', which was then appetizingly hot from the oven, has acquired something of the repulsiveness of half-cold mutton in half-congealed gravy". I quote from a paper entitled "Relations of Science and Religion" which the Knightsbridge professor of moral philosophy at Cambridge delivered as a lecture in 1939 and has now reprinted, with others, in a book.[1] Dr Broad takes the side of science in the debate, and I submit that he should be regarded as a distinguished spokesman on behalf of the average scientific person's outlook. Regarding the problem of attracting such an average person into the Church, the book, it seems to me, offers four valuable lessons.

The first is that natural science in its latest astounding developments does and can do nothing to give religious and moral beliefs a firmer rational basis.

It is part of the obsequiousness of the clerical approach to science to-day to suppose that it can. Professor Broad will not have it. He says: "There seems to be a widespread opinion that Sir Arthur Eddington and Sir James Jeans . . . have enabled the lion to lie down with the lamb." It is an opinion which he does not directly contradict. But a little later he picks up an argument first advanced, I believe, by Eddington—the argument, namely, that we may believe human volition sometimes affects the course of events in the material world *provided* the fundamental laws of physics are not determinist but statistical; and of that argument he says (p. 240) that it is "full of fallacies and confusions". That is of course the view of a scientifically minded philosopher. I do not see how a Christian could expect the argument to be anything else.

Another wild parallel has been attempted in the linguistic sphere. As Dr Broad says (also on p. 240):

> The concepts of relativistic and quantum physics cannot be grasped except by a person of considerable mathematical training who sees them as factors in a whole complicated context of theory. And they cannot be pictured at all. When attempts are made to express these concepts and laws in familiar language to uninstructed persons who interpret it literally, a mass of paradoxical and apparently self-contradictory verbiage results.

Hence some people have, as he recalls, come to imagine that "the mysterious and apparently nonsensical language of Christian theology" is on this account made a rational language. He will have no such theory. He remarks (p. 241, the italics are his):

> The following reflection is surely obvious. The fact that contemporary physics has to enunciate its principles in the form of apparent paradox and nonsense may be a good reason for hesitating to reject offhand *any* doctrine *merely* because it looks paradoxical and nonsensical when stated. But it cannot be a good reason for accepting any *one* form of apparent nonsense, e.g. the Athanasian Creed, in preference to any other form, e.g. the Kabbala or the Hegelian Dialectic.

[1] C. D. Broad, *Religion, Philosophy and Psychical Research* (Routledge, 25s.).

OF THE

It will be noticed that in that passage Professor Broad (although a philosopher) shows scant respect for Hegel—and also scant respect for the Athanasian creed. He is indeed no Christian. He says (p. 243): "I am not a Christian, and never have been one since I began to think for myself." The avowal follows at a distance the warning in his preface. This runs: "I have no religious beliefs and, so far as I can judge, I am completely devoid of anything that could fairly be called religious or mystical experience." If, then, he offers in his book strong testimony against transforming and distorting Christian theology and homiletics in a mistaken effort to make them attractive to scientists, and open to reconciliation with a scientific conscience, we have to recognize that the testimony is altogether disinterested.

Although repudiating the Christian faith, Dr Broad is a distinguished philosopher. And he has still other merits. For example, he is extremely ingenious. One paper in his book is an exposition in his own way of "Mr Dunne's Theory of Time". To follow this a reader needs the clearest of heads and the most undivided of attentions. It is a marvel of ingenuity. Professor Broad has also a fresh and arresting attitude to certain political questions. He prints in his book the text of a political lecture which he delivered in 1931. It is entitled "War Thoughts in Peace Time", and is followed by a more recent postscript. In the postscript is a highly informative paragraph about a sentence in the original lecture. The sentence refers "in very unflattering terms to the traditional note of the United States in its dealings with foreign nations". He does not contradict it, but says that he thinks that it was exaggerated even when it was written and that it would "now be indecent and most untimely to write and publish it". He retains it, he adds, "because it would be dishonest to omit it tacitly". On the subject of the 1914 war, he says that by the eve of its outbreak "we had raised legitimate expectations in the minds of the French by our actions; and we had accepted favours from France". He fails to make clear what the favours were, and—what is still more desirable—how the acceptance of them could have created an obligation to go to war. Nevertheless, the political section of the book abounds in statements which most of us would gain by reflecting upon. The following passage (p. 289) is characteristic:

> Sometimes the development of a certain social trend leads to results which almost all decent and sensible people deplore. Yet the development of that trend in any one society may make that community so powerful in relation to others that they are compelled to follow suit and to impose it on themselves if they will not be rendered impotent and perhaps have it and even worse things imposed on them by others. Large-scale industrialization and the great increase of urban population which accompanies it are a case in point. This is a development from which a nation with a reasonably small well-distributed population and a comfortable balance between agriculture, fishery, manufacture, etc., might well pray to be delivered. But those nations in which such a development takes place become so powerful from a military and economic standpoint that they can and do dictate the conditions of life to all others.

It is the opinion of the man who makes that extremely sensible observation that Christianity and science are not in conflict because they do not touch. There is the second of the four lessons to be drawn

from his book. He is unable to see why the specifically Christian dogmas (as distinct from those common to other religions) were ever cited before the tribunal of natural science. He says (p. 224):

> It is absurd to suppose that empirical science could prove or disprove, make probable or improbable, the doctrine of the existence and triune structure of the Godhead and of the uniquely intimate connexion between one of its differentiations and the man Jesus.

Naturally he has to put the matter in his own words, and for a churchman the words must sound queer. I shall come in a moment to the point which that raises. For the present let it be noted that here we have emanating from the scientific camp a strong objection to any surrender of Christian theology to natural science. The objection is that science has with the Christian dogmas little or nothing in common. Dr Broad says again (p. 226):

> It should be fairly clear that there are not many points at which the results of science and the doctrines peculiar to Christianity come into close enough contact for either conflict or co-operation between them to be possible.

What does that passage imply? If there is no close contact, no real contact at all, it follows that, supposing Christian theology actually could be put into scientific language without losing its present nature, it would remain just as unintelligible to scientific people as it is already. To try to translate Christian theology so that it shall fit the categories and rational modes of natural science would be to try to make it incredible and even nonsensical not only for scientists but for everybody, churchmen included. That is the third lesson which Professor Broad's book offers.

We have already seen how queer the profound and yet familiar dogma of the Holy Trinity becomes when Professor Broad translates it as Dr E. L. Allen demands that it shall be translated. Dr Broad also takes a shot at formulating in the language of scientists the dogma of the Incarnation, and this is how it comes out (pp. 221–22):

> There is some uniquely intimate relation between that eternal factor in the Godhead called "God the Son" and a certain man Jesus who was born at the village of Bethlehem during the reign of Augustus. This relation is such that it is appropriate to say of Jesus (and of no other man) that He was divine as well as human, and to say of God the Son (and of no other factor in the Godhead) that He is eternally human as well as divine.

Does any churchgoer imagine that if the Fourth Gospel had originally opened in that strain, Christianity would have spread over the world? No wonder Dr Broad himself adds: "I must confess that I can think of no interpretation of these statements which would enable me to attach a meaning to them"! Certainly, from the scientific standpoint, they have no meaning.

Nor is that all. Much of what is recorded in the Gospels must be blunt and unintelligible. For instance, Professor Broad says (p. 238) that Ptolemaic astronomy, it seems to him, is "assumed by Christ Himself; and some of His statements, which are perfectly sensible on that assumption, seem to be pointless on any other hypothesis". He adds:

"For me personally the Christian story and the Christian theology in a Copernican universe wither like a plant taken from a hothouse and bedded out in the Siberian desert." The instance seems to me eloquent. The Gospels cannot be made more attractive and understandable to scientific people through any messing about with their language. So long as scientific people remain on the scientific plane and within the scientific world of discourse, they can have no inkling of what the Gospels are about. They will never suspect that

> The idea behind all sacred writings is to convey a higher meaning than the literal words contain, the truth of which must be seen by Man *internally*. The higher, concealed, inner, or esoteric, meaning, cast in the words and sense images of ordinary usage, can . . . only be given to those who are close to grasping it rightly.[1]

That is one reason why the "inner sense" of sacred writings has to be given under cover. The men who clamour for theology to be put into "another language", who want to reconcile it with the consciences of the mathematically trained, who ask us to accept some fantastic and metaphorical "space" for theology—all such people have never understood what theology says. For otherwise they would know that it refuses to be translated. They are not satisfied when the scientists declare it nonsense; they want it drained of all content of its own and reduced to some fatuous expression of naturalism.

I pass to the fourth and last lesson which Professor Broad's book seems to offer. In spite of being himself, as he says, "devoid of religious beliefs" and "religious experience", he finds the topic of "religion" apparently inexhaustible. I am reminded of a saying of Montesquieu's: "The devout man and the atheist both speak of religion constantly: the one speaks of that to which he is attached; the other of that which he fears." It needs to be understood that Dr Broad distinguishes between "the doctrines peculiar to Christianity" and "doctrines peculiar to any of the great religions". If there is any conflict between religion and science, it will, he says, be over the latter. In that event, so he continues (p. 226):

> It will be over doctrines like the occurrence of miracles, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the question whether moral predicates are significant and applicable to men and their actions.

Regarding doctrines of that kind, it will be remembered that above I quoted Professor Broad as being doubtful whether the mathematical physics dear to Eddington and Jeans had quite succeeded in restoring religious tenets to a respectable status and made them again deserving of credence. But that turns out to have been, at least in part, because he has something else to vaunt in place of mathematical physics.

Like other Cambridge atheists before him, he is addicted (as the title of his book testifies) to what is called psychical research. He remarks (p. 220):

---

[1] Maurice Nicoll: *The New Man: An Interpretation of Some Parables and Miracles of Christ* (Stuart and Richards, London, 1950), p. 2, the author's italics.

> I cannot help reflecting that psychology, anthropology, and psychical research have made considerable advances as well as mathematical physics; and that they seem *prima facie* much more likely to be relevant to religion.

A more dubious statement would be hard to conceive. Of that, however, he is necessarily unsuspecting, and a dozen pages or so later, anent the belief of survival after death, he declares (p. 236) that for "this essential doctrine of religion psychical research is the only *possible* gift-horse in the field of the sciences". He goes on, apparently in support of that claim, to tell of "phantasms". The word "phantasm" is plainly a technical term of psychical research. To what it applies, we learn as we read on. He insists that some truth cannot be denied to the reports of "phantasms" of the living, of the dying, and of the recently dead, that are "seen" (his quotation marks) "by educated Englishmen who were awake and in normal bodily and mental health at the time". Our atheist has his spooks! But we may reasonably ask what on earth they can have to do with belief in the immortality of the soul?

It is not that he hesitates to account for the "seeing" of phantasms. Indeed, throughout the first two sections of the book he is possessed by a very demon of explanation. There are no fewer than five papers devoted to psychical research, as well as repeated puffs for psychical research in the papers ostensibly devoted to "religion". Table-rapping, levitation, post-hypnotic suggestion, and haruspication, do not seem to be dealt with. Professor Broad confines himself to "phantasms", telepathy, clairvoyance, and Mr Dunne's geometrizing of the apparent feats of the crystal-gazer. Trains of argument are grounded in experiments with keys which, on being pressed, cause lights to come on inside opaque boxes, and on experiments in card-guessing conducted by Dr Soal in England and by Professor Rhine in the United States. No doubt it is all extremely fascinating for its votaries. But it suggests that Professor Broad is not only ingenious, but ingenuous as well. For, by the side of the cultivation of the spiritual life, everything investigated by psychical research remains unutterably trivial. Again, in explaining how "phantasms" come to be "seen", Dr Broad speaks of "telepathic impact" and of "subconscious process". His explanation, that is to say, is purely naturalistic. As regards the immortality of the soul, it is necessarily irrelevant.

The fourth and last lesson which is to be drawn from the book is that, for people whose horizons are limited by their studies in natural science, there is an undeniable danger that they may become incapable of differentiating in other domains between the trivial and the momentous, *a fortiori* between the naturalistic and the religious.

And that is the way those who want Christian theology and Christian teaching adapted to the scientific mind are asking that the Christian Church shall go. Heaven forbid!

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

The Acoustics of Churches

PART of the plans for the enlargement of an ancient parish church into a cathedral was the addition of a chapel which, being self-contained and set apart from the main building, could be used for small gatherings of people at daily services and Quiet Days. When the chapel was completed, everyone was pleased with it. Beautiful in design, admirable in execution, noble in its proportions, it seemed an ideal setting for worship. Alas, for the vanity of human wishes! A grievous disappointment was in store. When services were held in it, it proved to have one of the worst defects from which a building can suffer. Acoustically it was so bad that the spoken word could hardly be heard in it.

When it is difficult to hear in church, blame must not always fall on the architect and on the acoustics. The fault may be with clergy and lay readers who speak in it. In the time of one of the Tudors, it is on record that a parish priest did public penance for the sin of inaudibility, confessing, "whereas I, good people, have many times in saying Divine Service mumbled the same in such sort that few or none of my parishioners could understand the same, by God's assistance I will endeavour from henceforth to read, sing, and say Divine Service distinctly and plainly". If the clergy will mumble, the best acoustics will not supply the remedy. To read or speak with proper elevation of the voice, due emphasis and accent, to be easily audible without being noisy or vulgar, requires good training, unremitting care and humble grateful attention to the criticism of friends.

Difficulty in hearing is often caused by deafness in the members of the congregation. Deafness is one of the saddest of infirmities, and where it cannot be relieved by hearing aids is a more cruel affliction than blindness, for while blindness cuts a man from the world of things, deafness isolates him from persons. It is not therefore surprising that an infirmity so much to be dreaded is slow to be acknowledged. When speakers find themselves unjustly accused of being difficult to hear, it is not always kind to point out the real reason.

Power of hearing is vitally affected by the degree of attention given to what is being said. One who listens eagerly is twice blessed, a blessing both to himself and to the speaker. An attentive ear in the congregation gives voice and word to the preacher. Not all listen in this way, so that many things said in church, good in substance and well delivered, are not heard by some, and the reason is neither mumbling nor deafness nor bad acoustics but wandering thoughts and unwillingness to hear truth which must smite before it can heal. If the vicar or minister were to say on Sunday, "Good people, a rich parishioner has died and left his entire fortune to individual members of the congregation from the youngest choir boy to the oldest sidesman, so in place of the sermon this morning I will read out the list and the amounts of his benefactions", some people who are deaf to sermons on prayer and the forgiveness of enemies would hear remarkably well.

When every allowance has been made for human frailties of voice,

ear, or temperament, the fact remains that nothing but bad acoustics accounts for the difficulty of hearing in the chapel we have described and in many modern churches. The better the voice of the speaker, the finer in timbre and resonance, the harder it is to hear. Why is this and what makes churches or halls acoustically defective?

Acoustics is a branch of science so complex and technical that only the well-versed physicist can understand it. Put simply, the problem is this. In a building the audience hears a sound from the speaker first by a direct path—the shorter this path the better the hearing—and then by a series of reflections or reverberations of the sound from the floors, walls, and ceiling. Now, if there is too little resonance from these reflections, sound does not carry well and it is particularly bad for singing or music. Where there is too much reverberation, it happens that before the sound of one word has died away another comes to confuse it and neither can be heard clearly. The amount of reverberated sound is decided by the shape of the building, the size and number of doors and windows, the hardness of the walls and the amount of wall and ceiling space, by the presence or absence of carpets and curtains, which always absorb the sounds and so lessen reverberation, and, to a certain extent, by the number of people in the building. For good hearing reverberation of a sound should not exceed two or three seconds: in some modern churches and halls it is as long as eight or nine seconds. Since reverberation can now be calculated, co-operation between phsyicist and architect ought to ensure good acoustics in all buildings, cathedrals, churches, halls, and schools.

"Houses are built to live in and not to look at", says one of the greatest of English writers who, in a famous essay, argues that if you have to choose in the design of a house between beauty of appearance and convenience in use, beauty must be sacrificed. In building a church the choice may be between one good to look at and one good to hear in. Which ought to be considered more, the ear or the eye of the worshipper?

A church is seen outside and inside all the year round all the hours of the day. There it stands, a sermon in stone, "infinity made imaginable", speaking with its beauty of colour and of line to tired hearts and depressed spirits, of the presence of God, of the awfulness of his holiness and the wonder of his love. In Sacraments and in Common Prayer there are things to be seen as well as heard, things done as well as spoken. So how important the appearance of the church to the eye!

These considerations, strengthened by the natural despotism of the eye, have had a fatal fascination for architects who have built for us churches good to look at but difficult to hear in and so disadvantageous for Christian worship in which it is far more important to hear than to see. In Christian worship as understood and practised in the Church of England, the people of God are present to hear the Word of God through the word of the minister and to raise their own voices in praise and in prayer. They are not present as dumb spectators of splendid ceremonial, but as active participants in the

Divine work of prayer. Mattins, Evensong, the Litany, Holy Communion itself, are not cast in the form of monologues for priests but as dialogues for priest and people together. The reading of and the interpretation of Holy Scripture in the Sermon are a preparation for prayer and communion, but how can they do this unless they can be heard by the people? Let our architects and church builders note this essential characteristic of Christian worship, master the principles of acoustics, and then build churches in which the human voice well trained, properly used, and eagerly listened to, may be used for the glory of God and the edification of his people.

H. Hodkin.

The Day of the Last Supper

This question has long been debated by New Testament scholars and it does not seem much nearer a solution. Any one who looks at the very long list of discussions given by J. Jeremias in his *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu* (2nd ed. 1949) will see that opinion is about equally divided, with a preference among many British scholars for the Johannine date, the 13th of Nisan, as against the 14th, the day of the Jewish Passover meal.

With great learning and an easy use of the complicated data Professor Chr. N. Ghiaouroff has examined the question afresh in his scholarly essay, *Le Jour de la Sainte-Cène*, in the *Annuaire de L'Académie de Théologie, "St Clément d'Ochrida"*, Sofia, Tome II (xxviii), 1951–52, pp. 145–200. He examines the evidence of the Old Testament and the Rabbinical Literature, as well as that of the Gospels, and comes to the conclusion that St John is right in placing the Supper the day before that of the Jewish Passover Meal. He does not believe, however, that there is any contradiction between John and the Synoptists. *Selon les quatre évangélistes, la Sainte-Cène fut accomplie le jeudi, 13 nisan, et le lendemain, vendredi, 14 nisan, Jésus-Christ fut jugé et crucifié* (p. 186). He takes the view that the Supper was a special meal organized by Jesus Christ, to which he gave a religious character; there he instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist and pronounced his discourse of farewell to his disciples and his sacerdotal prayer to the Heavenly Father.

Opinions are bound to differ regarding this hypothesis. I think Professor Ghiaouroff is justified in his approval of the Johannine date in view of John 13. 1, 29; 18. 28; 19. 14, not to mention other evidence; but it seems much less certain that the Synoptic Gospels do not identify the Last Supper with the Passover Meal, and accordingly imply that it was celebrated on the 14th of Nisan, although there is not a little evidence in these Gospels which supports the representation of the Fourth Gospel. The vital point is whether we interpret Mark 14. 12 and the parallel passages as referring to "the *first* day of unleavened bread", as the Greek is usually rendered, or give to the superlative adjective the meaning "*before*" (cf. John 1. 30),

and further whether "when they sacrificed the passover" does, or does not, precisely define this day. There is no doubt that Professor Ghiaouroff presents his case with great skill and ability and every New Testament student must be grateful to him for the opportunity his essay affords of reviewing yet again this interesting and important question. It will be recalled that some British scholars, including W. C. Allen, have felt inclined to explain Mark 14. 12 in a similar manner. It may be doubted, after the investigations of Professor Jeremias, whether ἄρτος must mean "leavened bread". Whatever conclusion the reader reaches on the question of the date, he cannot fail to be grateful for Professor Ghiaouroff's learned and stimulating discussion.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. H. Dammers is Chaplain and Lecturer in English at St John's College, Palamcottah, South India.

The Rev. E. H. Gordon is Vicar of Christ Church, Battersea.

Mr Belgion is the author of *Our Present Philosophy of Life*, etc.

The Rev. H. Hodkin is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Millhouses, Sheffield.

CORRESPONDENCE

MINISTERIUM VERBI DIVINI

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

"It would seem to be wise strategy . . ." argued the Archdeacon of Durham in your November issue, "to counsel all men seeking Holy Orders to read theology in the University." May I take this thesis a step further down the educational ladder, and consider how professional theologians, parish clergy, and educated laymen respectively, might benefit if theology were to take her place as an autonomous discipline along with mathematics, history, and the rest at our public and grammar schools? I hasten to add that my only qualification for doing so is a negative one; a keen regret that my own theological studies were not begun until the mature age of twenty-three!

1. Professional theologians. Rightly or wrongly English theological students to-day get the impression that German-speaking scholars still hold the theological initiative. The Archdeacon referred to his own experience at Marburg University where "the students of theology were numbered in hundreds and not in tens". We must ask how many of those men had already acquired at school some knowledge of Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew (dare I add English?); essential tools for the theological trade.

2. Parish clergy. In the diocese in which I served my title five years ago those in charge of the theological training of the younger clergy

concentrated on a despairing attempt to persuade us that there was such a thing as moral theology. Most of us, I suspect, still have our doubts! This brought home to me how inadequate was our professional equipment; not so much as compared with the Roman priest across the road (in some respects we were better equipped than he), but as compared with the local doctor who took his first M.B. at school, or even the local millowner who adorned the Business Fifth and Sixth at his public school for the two years after taking School Certificate. Even those few of us who had read theology at the university had acquired in the main not so much a theology as prolegomena, which we could have gained with fewer tears at school. In the ordinands' fellowship of the same diocese an increasing proportion had discovered their vocation in their early teens. Of such could be the nucleus of a "theological sixth" at school.

3. Educated laymen. But only the nucleus: to quote the Archdeacon again: "Theology is . . . one of the best means to a liberal education. It involves the study of languages . . . of a great literature . . . of the thought of men whose writings have profoundly influenced subsequent history . . . of cultures and civilizations very different from our own . . . of history, archeology, architecture, art, music, paleography, philosophy. . . . Above all it confronts the student with the problems of man's origin, man's nature and man's destiny . . . by confronting him with God." Let this enumeration suffice, not only to silence the murmur of "specialization", but also to indicate that not only the "lay movement" in the Church, but also the administration of the welfare state and the development of our cultural heritage would benefit from the establishment of a "theological side" at our grammar and public schools. Particular mention may perhaps be made of colonial administration. The indigenous leaders with whom colonial administrators are increasingly working have often been educated in a positively Christian environment. For full co-operation the deeper the understanding of the Christian tradition on both sides the better.

But is a "theological side" practical politics? Again I can speak only out of a very limited personal experience. Two years of pastoral contact with a group of public-school boys and girls have convinced me that they respond far more acutely to theological issues than we did before the war. One headmaster assured me that younger members of his staff in particular were eager to teach theology as skilfully as their own subject. But another pointed out that his boys regarded as "real" subjects only those for which the Universities offered open scholarships. On my mentioning this to the Senior Tutor of one of the colleges at an ancient University, he at once volunteered to bring the matter before the College Council. If my contentions are sound, this would seem the vital point. Those responsible for offering open scholarships can act only on an active public opinion such as, on this matter, readers of THEOLOGY could do much to create.

Yours, etc.,

17, MILLERS ROAD,
BANGALORE.

A. H. DAMMERS.

HOW CHRISTIAN WAS SHAKESPEARE?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In your December issue Dr Elliott makes a sweeping and unjustified assertion about "the average teacher of English", whether in America or in Great Britain, when he writes: "His most compelling motive for regarding Shakespeare as a sceptic or unbeliever is that this is what he himself is; he reads his own view into the plays." The Christian teacher is not obliged to find in Shakespeare an explicit or implicit exposition of the Christian faith; if he cannot find it, there is no reflection upon his own sincerity.

The strongest point in Dr Elliott's argument is found in the passages quoted from *The Merchant of Venice, Measure for Measure,* and *Henry IV Part I,* where the natural, unaffected language of Christians is put in the mouth of certain characters. From this we gather that Shakespeare was probably an orthodox Christian, though we must beware of the fallacy involved in identifying him with his creations. It may please us to identify him with Prospero, but not with Polonius, Leontes, or Pandarus. Like Dickens, he eludes us among the thronging creatures of his imagination.

The attempt to interpret the great tragedies in terms of Christian dogma is doomed to failure. The tragic hero's supreme virtue is magnanimity, the greatness of soul that prevents him from being a craven or an ingrate when disaster comes. Suicide is regarded as an honourable end, not a mortal sin, and after death "the rest is silence". It is incredible that Dr Elliott can speak of Othello, after the murder of Desdemona, as a humbled and converted man. In his agony of mind, he still recalls his martial triumphs, and his last words describe his violence against the "malignant and turban'd Turk" who "beat a Venetian and traduc'd the state". What kind of a convert is it who can speak thus of the hope of salvation?

> O ill-starr'd wench,
> Pale as thy smock! When we shall meet at compt
> This look of thine will hurl my soul from heaven,
> And fiends will snatch at it.

A. C. Bradley's analysis of the "Substance of Tragedy" in the first lecture of his *Shakespearean Tragedy* has not been superseded. The fact of waste, found in the destruction of both good and evil, is the underlying principle of Shakespearean tragedy. Shakespeare may have reconciled this principle with acceptance of Christian doctrine, but it cannot be demonstrated from his plays that he did so. "Shakespeare was not attempting to justify the ways of God to men, or to show the universe as a Divine Comedy. He was writing tragedy, and tragedy would not be tragedy if it were not a painful mystery" (A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy,* p. 38).

Yours faithfully,
A. T. P. BYLES.

ST MATTHEW'S VICARAGE,
WEST KENSINGTON.
5 *December* 1953.

BOOK REVIEWS

ORIGEN: CONTRA CELSUM. Translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge University Press. 60s.

For sixty years British scholarship has been extraordinarily silent upon Origen. In 1886 C. Bigg produced his *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*; in 1893 J. Armitage Robinson edited the *Philocalia*; and in 1896 A. E. Brooke the *Commentary on John*. Since then nothing that could be called a major work on Origen has been produced in the British Isles. Fragments of Origen have been edited by J. A. F. Gregg (1902), by C. Jenkins (1909), and by A. Ramsbotham (1913). In 1901 W. Fairweather published a modest textbook on *Origen and Greek Patristic Theology*, quite a capable piece of work, if we except one frightful howler in the last chapter; in 1936 G. W. Butterworth translated the *De Principiis*, and G. L. Prestige has written an interesting essay on Origen in his *Fathers and Heretics* (1940). Otherwise British writers have been content to refer to Origen only *en passant* and have not betrayed (even though they may have possessed) a great acquaintance with his works. N. P. Williams, who in his *magnum opus* gives a wholly untrustworthy account of Origen's doctrine of sin, misled by blindly trusting to Harnack's reconstruction of the order of Origen's works, is unfortunately typical of the way in which many scholars deal with Origen.

Now Mr Chadwick has broken this silence by a translation of the *Contra Celsum*, with an Introduction and Notes. The *Contra Celsum* is in some ways the most important, though it is not the most characteristic, of Origen's works. In his reply to Celsus Origen is noticeably more restrained in his interpretation of Christianity than in most of his other works. He is much less of the "Christian Gnostic", less addicted to allegory (though of course he does not eschew it altogether), more ready to hint at or pass lightly over his own speculative theology and to adopt a position more firmly in the main stream of Christian tradition than elsewhere. The *Contra Celsum* is therefore an example—and a magnificent example—not so much of Origen's individual thought (for this one should go to that admirable and useful Bedside Book of Origen, the *Philocalia*) as of third-century Christian apologetics.

Mr Chadwick has done full justice to this work. In a single volume of some 550 large pages, beautifully though not inexpensively produced by the Cambridge University Press, he has combined a translation into flowing and effective modern English, well sustained and almost entirely free from "translator's English", a long Introduction, and a series of Notes so full and so informative as to amount to a running commentary. It is obvious that he is not one of those scholars who are content to use an Index Verborum and their own inspired guesses to interpret Origen. He has read all Origen's works thoroughly. He has studied the history of the text and frequently notes variant readings and emendations, and he has read widely—nay exhaustively—in original texts and works in English, French,

German, and Italian, in order to elucidate the background to Origen's thought. Indeed henceforward his Bibliography and Notes ought to be a treasury of information to scholars (and not to English scholars only) who are studying the philosophical or the religious background of third-century Christianity. He has gone far to atone in our generation for the lack of Origenist scholars from which our country has suffered. The only omissions which we can detect in his ample Bibliography are two articles by J. Lebreton in French periodicals and a work by F. Prat, *Origène, le Théologien et l'Exégète*.

It is unfortunate (but certainly not Mr Chadwick's fault) that the circumstances of the publishing trade apparently precluded his publishing the Greek text of *Contra Celsum* with an Apparatus Criticus and his Notes attached, for the use of scholars, and producing the translation as a separate volume, for those who are not experts but would profit from reading so good a translation of so important a work. As it is, the experts will need a Greek text to appreciate the Notes properly, and the ordinary reader may find the Notes altogether too learned. We doubt, for instance, if many people will be interested in the suggestion on p. 350 (note 5) about further reading on the subject of inebriated nurses in the ancient world!

The only criticism of any substance suggested by the book is that, for a work which is in other respects so detailed and finished, surprisingly little attention is paid to the evidence by which we can date the *Contra Celsum*. Two pages of the Introduction only are devoted to this point, and after reading them the reader is left in considerable uncertainty as to the exact date of the book. But in fact (quite apart from the attempt to connect *Contra Celsum* with the celebration of the millennium of Rome) by an accumulation of small probabilities we can reach something near certainty in placing the work in the year 248. Granted that the limits in which we have to work are 244–9, we can reach this conclusion by the following argument: Origen in *Contra Celsum* (V. 47) refers to his *Commentary on Romans*, which, as Mr Chadwick admits (Introd., p. xiv), must be put between 244 and 247. The *Commentary on Matthew* refers to the *Commentary on Romans*, and must therefore have been written after it. But we must put the *Commentary on Matthew* some time before 247, as it is referred to in one of the *Homilies on Psalms* (a Homily on Ps. 38, Migne, *P.G.* XII. 1375), and an historical reference in these Homilies enables us to date them to 247 (see the Homily on Ps. 37, Migne *P.G.* XII. 1323). The *Commentary on Matthew*, then, a large work, not very easily tossed off, even by Origen, can most suitably be placed in 246. Now the *Contra Celsum* could conceivably be put between the *Commentary on Romans* and the *Commentary on Matthew*, but several small points, such as the imminence of persecution reflected in it and the phrase *the present grave civil war* (quoted by Mr Chadwick, Introd., p. xv) suggest that it is much more satisfactory to place it just before the Decian persecution, in 248. This conclusion is confirmed if we see in *Contra Celsum* VII. 55 a reference to the *Commentary on Matthew* (*Comm. Ser.* 92). We have thereby incidentally narrowed the limits of the date of the

Commentary on Romans to 244–5. Again, Mr Chadwick refers (p. 404, n. 2), among other works of Origen, to his *Commentary on Ezekiel* (which is no longer extant), and describes it as written "during Origen's Caesarean period", 238–44. This vague phrase (Origen probably lived in Caesarea 232–5 and 245–9 as well) conceals the fact that Eusebius tells us (*H.E.* VI. 32) that this Commentary was finished by Origen when he was in Athens and that we can with fair confidence place this visit to Athens in 243–4.

But these are only minor blemishes on a most satisfying work of able and finished scholarship.

University of Nottingham. R. P. C. Hanson.

Le Baptême Chrétien au Second Siècle. By André Benoît. Presses Universitaires de France. 1,000 frs.

Supporters of the general thesis of Prof. G. W. H. Lampe's book, *The Seal of the Spirit,* will find much to hearten them in this careful analysis of baptismal theology in Christian writers of the second century, recently published by the Maître de Conférences of the Protestant Theological Faculty of Strasbourg. Separate chapters are devoted to the Didache, Barnabas, Ignatius, 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Hermas, Justin (with glances at other Apologists), and Irenaeus. The regularity with which the Spirit-gift is found to be directly associated with the laver is impressive. In more than one place the contentions of those who have tried to detect "confirmation" in this period are well answered (e.g. Dix, pp. 174–8 and elsewhere; Coppens, pp. 102–3). Since Dr Benoît's work was completed well before *The Seal of the Spirit* was published (the latest date in the bibliography is 1949), his observations add weight to those of Prof. Lampe. There is scope for interesting comparisons to be made between statements about *sphragis* in the work under review and Prof. Lampe's study of that word. Here again the measure of agreement seems at a first reading to be considerable.

But Prof. Benoît's main concern is to disclose how very little of specifically *Pauline* baptismal doctrine is exhibited in the extant writings of the second-century Church, even in the case of Irenaeus. The *en Christo* mysticism, the death-resurrection union with Christ, the Red Sea prefiguring, all these are never truly repeated by the writers concerned, even though some of these know St Paul and quote him for various purposes. On the other hand, the same patient search discloses a broad underlying unity in baptismal theology, wherein the twin foci of the baptismal ellipse are Remission of Sins and the Gift of the Spirit, with the themes of New Birth, Regeneration, Illumination, and possibly exorcism also finding their place in the pattern. This tradition is, of course, largely New Testament in origin, though coloured in second-century thought with a fair measure of Hellenism. The author suggestively supposes that in the period A.D. 40–180 (approx.) there were several, or many, parallel forms of "Hellenistic Christianity" of which "Paulinism" was only

one, and one which did not happen to affect significantly the theological *milieux* of the second-century writers whose works we have. If Dr Benoît is right, light is thrown upon the important and fascinating question of the large place occupied by St Paul's writings in the New Testament Canon. Whereas the old view that St Paul was "misunderstood" required that the Holy Spirit must have performed a sheer miracle in securing the canonization of the Apostle's writings, our author's view would allow that large parts of the Church after *not* having had Paul as part of their essential tradition, *later* came to be introduced to his Epistles, but only *later still* (under divine inspiration) discerned something of his real importance.

Prof. Benoît discloses not only the underlying unity but with equal vigour the great diversity between the writers with whom he is concerned. Along with this he draws attention to certain alliances of thought which are not immediately evident, between two or three Fathers in each case. Particularly interesting is his treatment of the question of post-baptismal repentance, in respect of which Justin and Irenaeus are carefully compared with Hermas for similarity and difference.

It is a pity that a book with such careful study behind it and having so comprehensive a bibliography should be denied any but the shortest index. And the spelling, especially in English (occasionally German), is faulty in places. But these matters cannot affect our gratitude to the author for his painstaking and fruitful research.

Todwick Rectory, Sheffield. John C. Sladden.

Friends for 300 Years. Beliefs and Practice of the Society of Friends since George Fox started the Quaker Movement. By Howard Brinton. Allen and Unwin. 15s.

This book, as its sub-title suggests, is an exposition of Quaker belief and practice, not a historical survey. It is an illuminating book and one for which Christians who are not members of the Society of Friends will be extremely grateful.

Anyone who has known Quakers and attended their meetings does not need to be told that Quakerism does not fit easily into the pattern of English nonconformity. In this book Dr Brinton pleads for Quakerism as a third force to be distinguished both from traditional Catholicism and traditional Protestantism, whilst having something in common with each over against the other. In common with Catholicism Quakers hold a less pessimistic view of man than Protestant theology usually allows, they lay great stress on "natural theology" (though they would not call it that), they have never regarded the Scriptures as the final court of appeal, and they have always valued the Hellenic as well as the Hebraic heritage in Christianity. Their chief resemblance, however, as Dr Rufus Jones was always pointing out, is that Quakerism like Catholicism is a mystical religion. Dr Brinton tells us that "the works of Mme Guyon, Fenelon and Molinos could at one time be found in every Quaker library"

(p. 72). (This fact might interest R. A. Knox.) But this is mysticism without monasticism. Quakers begot large families and made no effort to withdraw from the business of the world, in fact "there is no record of a recluse among them" (p. 65). Like some Protestants they stress the inwardness of faith, have a distrust of all externals in worship and of all organized spiritual authority. Their primary belief is in God the Holy Spirit, who makes himself known as they wait in silence for him: such silence Dr Brinton claims to be a sacrament, for there God and man meet. Dr Brinton refuses to allow that Quakers are Pelagians; he quotes several passages to show that the first purpose of "the inner light" is to show up sin.

The chapter on "The Meeting and the World" is particularly valuable in explaining Quaker social pioneering. "The pioneering quality of Quaker social work is largely due to the character of the meeting for worship. Silent waiting worship permits a fresh and direct facing of facts under conditions in which the conscience becomes sensitized" (p. 145). Here is some explanation both of their great social achievement and their early liberal attitude on many questions, for instance in the seventeenth century Quakers had already accepted the equality of the sexes and given women responsibility; also they had adopted a critical view of the Bible and were preaching Universalism.

Dr Brinton's book is amply illustrated from the history of the Society of Friends both in this country and America.

St Aidan's College, Birkenhead. Michael Hennell.

The Courage to be. By Paul Tillich. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

An anatomy of anxiety is a desideratum of the contemporary Church no less than of the contemporary world; for while many will agree with Dr Tillich that to describe our day as an "age of anxiety" is to employ what is nearly a truism, few whose commission it is to proclaim that gospel which is the cure for it can give an account of what anxiety is. The author gives his account, effectively focusing attention on man as man, not exclusively as modern man. Both in his survey of previous views, ancient and modern, and in his systematic exposition he plunges deeply and throws up many insights.

There is a definition: anxiety is the existential awareness of non-being. "Existential" here signifies that the awareness of non-being is of non-being as a part of one's own being. "It is not the realization of universal transitoriness, not even the experience of the death of others, but the impression of these events on the always latent awareness of our own having to die, that produces anxiety" (p. 33). Three types of existential anxiety correspond to three directions in which non-being threatens being: the anxiety of death (the threat to man's ontic self-affirmation), the anxiety of meaninglessness (the threat to man's spiritual self-affirmation), the anxiety of condemnation (the threat to man's moral self-affirmation). The three forms of anxiety are not separable; but one or other will dominate the rest in the experience of awareness whether in a period in history or in an

individual's life. All are existential in that they are "given with human existence itself", and it is against their background that we are to recognize pathological, neurotic, any particularly modern anxiety, arising from special contingencies or conditions.

The general inquirer will be especially grateful for the illustrations and examination of existential thinking and for the demonstration of the relevance of this to a modern restatement of Christian tenets. Restatement, often making heavy demands on the attention of the reader, is in fact the strength of this book, as in the bold terminus to the argument which is a rephrasing, free of traditional terminology, of the Reformation formula, justification by faith, in terms of "accepting acceptance"—"the courage to be is the courage to accept oneself as accepted in spite of being unacceptable" (p. 156).

These lectures, delivered in 1952 at Yale under the Dwight H. Terry Foundation, are a summons to Christians to adopt, or at the very least to test, new categories of thought in meeting the challenges of the present situation. Incidentally, as a result of discerning comments on American points of view and assumptions they may do much to encourage mutual fertilization of thinking between Christians on both sides of the Atlantic.

GORING-BY-SEA. W. W. S. MARCH.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION. The A. S. Eddington Memorial Lecture, 1953. By H. H. Price. Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.

Professor Price is one of the most esteemed among living philosophers, and anything from his pen is deserving of attention. The title of his lecture may perhaps be to some a deterrent, since science and religion are both terms that cover such a variety of meanings that a general discussion in short space might seem unprofitable. But it is only with "some aspects" of the conflict between them that Professor Price is concerned, and what those aspects are he defines with characteristic precision and lucidity. His treatment of the conflict has an existential quality, not in the sense that it is rooted in any particular existentialist philosophy, but that the questions with which he is concerned are not for him of merely intellectual interest but of man's very existence.

Two things seem to him fundamental and essential to the religious attitude to life. The first is the basic theistic assertions of religion. The conflict between the religious and the scientific outlooks cannot be evaded by maintaining that religion is only the recommendation of a way of life and cannot therefore come into conflict with scientific propositions. A way of life must in the last resort be based on a theory of the universe. This is obviously true of Christianity. We cannot cultivate, or even understand, the emotional and conative attitudes inculcated by Christianity without assenting to certain beliefs about the nature of reality. It is no less true of a non-theistic religion like Buddhism that the way of life it recommends is inseparable from a theory of the universe.

Science is certainly in no position to assert that the basic theistic propositions are false, but it may claim that no human being is entitled to assert them as true, and that is what the great majority of educated people do, in fact, maintain to-day. If religious believers are to meet this challenge, the only ground on which they can stand is that of religious experience. They must assert that in men, in varying degrees of intensity, there is what may be described as a "sense of the divine". In maintaining this they will come into head-on collision with the tenets of scientific naturalism, which is the prevailing intellectual climate of to-day. In its view the only cognitive capacities which human beings possess are sense perception, memory, conceptual thought and possibly introspection (though some naturalists would deny the last). Over against this religious believers must affirm that, in addition to these, man possesses a further capacity for being aware of the divine. Many people believe that the question has already been settled in favour of the naturalistic view, but Professor Price is not convinced that truth is necessarily on the side of the big battalions, or even on the side of the highly educated.

The second fundamental conflict arises from the fact that the religious view is committed to a belief in other worlds—other, that is to say, than the world disclosed by sense perception—and at this point the conflict between the scientific and the religious outlooks is, if possible, even more acute. Professor Price holds that these other-worldly beliefs, which are necessary to the religious outlook, are not deducible directly from the basic theistic propositions, but must rest on empirical evidence, i.e. on the testimony of men of religious genius who have had direct experience of these other worlds. This contention is open to question, and in any case the term "other worlds" calls for much fuller examination than is possible in a brief review. But it can hardly be doubted that the other-worldly beliefs which Professor Price has in view are in *some* sense an essential part of the religious outlook.

It is clear from what Professor Price has written elsewhere, though he does not explicitly say so in this lecture, that the two sets of beliefs which have been mentioned are alone able to give a satisfying meaning to human existence, and that it is a matter of profound concern that men should be able to hold them. But in the minds of many people they encounter what appears to be an insuperable objection. They are rejected by "the great majority of educated western Europeans", and the ground of their rejection is what Professor Price calls "the materialistic conception of human personality". By this he means the apparently incontrovertible dependence of mental processes on bodily ones. This view has very formidable arguments in its favour, and it seems to him that "religious thinkers have not usually appreciated how very strong the case against them is". Just because this view is so widespread and deep-seated, it appears to Professor Price a fact of the highest importance that its validity has been called in question on empirical grounds by the results of psychical research. There can be no doubt that supernormal cognition does occur, and this suggests that the dependence of mental events on

bodily processes is less strict than has been generally assumed. This does not in any way establish the truth of religious beliefs. Supernormal cognition is not at all the same as the religious awareness of the divine. But what psychical research has done, in Professor Price's view, is to remove, or at least to undermine, the greatest *obstacle* to religious belief, i.e. the conception of human personality which is accepted as a matter of course by a large majority of western educated people. If it can be shown on empirical grounds, to which alone they will pay any attention, that their basic assumptions are questionable, the claims which religious people make may at least get a hearing.

Any treatment of the relations of science and religion in limited space must raise a host of questions, but we are greatly in Professor Price's debt for an unusually clear, forceful, and arresting discussion of some at least of the major issues.

Dunford College. J. H. Oldham.

The Word. By Adrienne von Speyr. Collins. 10s. 6d.

Die Gleichnisse Jesu. By Joachim Jeremias. Zwingli-Verlag, Zurich. Fr. 10.10 (D.M. 9.70).

Adrienne von Speyr's book is the first of her prolific writings to appear in English; it is an extraordinary work, and forms the opening chapters of her four-volume meditation (in German) on St John's Gospel: in the present book we get as far as verse 18 of the first chapter. The translator must have had a formidable task in grappling with the weird movements of the author's thought; here and there he shows his skill in rendering the more eloquent and straightforward passages.

On the inside of the dustcover T. S. Eliot is quoted as saying of the book that it "does not lend itself to any classification that I can think of. It is not dogmatic theology; still less is it exegesis. It cannot be properly described as mysticism, or a sceptical [*sic*] theology; nor is it, in any usual sense, a book of meditation. It can only be described in negatives." It need not be stressed, therefore, that the author sits rather loosely to the text of the Fourth Evangelist; where there is direct treatment of the text, the exegesis is eccentric, as for instance where "the beginning" of the first verse of the Prologue is equated with God the Father; or where, discussing verses 10 and 11, the author makes the reference apply to the new creation, not the old.

Most of the main themes of Catholic theology and ecclesiology find their way into these pages, this comprehensiveness being justified by the statement (pp. 16 f.) that "they (i.e. the Church and Sacraments) too are present in the unexpressed word of God, contained in the word from the beginning, because while not yet instituted and still unexpressed, formless and to us unimaginable, they are already contained therein and themselves contain that which constitutes the fullness of the love of God . . . they are, therefore, unexpressed but most really present in the opening verses of John's Prologue". We

are then to listen to a highly original voice, the expression of a deeply spiritual mind; it will speak to the condition of some, but many will find it hard to appreciate and harder still to understand, for side by side with translucent aphorisms there are dark and baffling sayings.

It is impossible to summarize the themes discussed; attention ought to be drawn to some admirable pages on the doctrine of the Trinity (21 ff.), on the mystery of Christ (58 f.), on the sacrament of Penance (87 ff.), and on sin and sinfulness (149). The interesting treatment of the Church's infallibility (153) has more in common with the Orthodox doctrine of Tradition than with normal Roman Catholic discussions of the subject. More questionable passages may be found; for example, on pages 76 ff., where a new version of the double standard is propounded; on page 93, where it is implied that the effect of the Blessed Sacrament is the same when adored as when received in Communion; and on page 146, on the doctrine of grace. It is only with a sense of strain that the average reader would connect these subjects with the Johannine Prologue. Misprints have been noted on pages 65, 84, 107, and 115.

Dr Jeremias' book is a second and larger edition of a work first published in 1947; it is an extremely competent and thorough study of the parables, attempting to go behind the interpretations of the early Church to the original words and meaning of the Lord himself. The whole task of criticism and analysis is conducted in a reverent manner, and the work abounds with illuminating remarks, often buried in rather technical footnotes. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to C. H. Dodd's *The Parables of the Kingdom*, and the latter will remain the staple diet for English readers. The German-reading student, however, will be amply repaid for his efforts to read Dr Jeremias.

The author rightly urges that we must get back to the mind of the Lord himself, if our preaching of the parables is to have real power. Most of the present researches along these lines conclude that the parables were addressed to the immediate opponents of the Gospel and not to the disciples (as in the exegesis of the early Church, which has everywhere left its traces on the form, content, and context of the parables). Is it not likely that the mind of the Incarnate Lord was a little broader than this? And that he intended the parables to speak to Christians and non-Christians of every generation? Dr Jeremias furnishes the materials for a study of the parables in a larger manner, which would include recommendations for their use in contemporary preaching and teaching.

EALING. D. W. ALLEN.

SELECTION I, a Yearbook of Contemporary Thought. Edited by Cecily Hastings and Donald Nicholl. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

First of all I should like to give a warm welcome to this book, and to express the hope that it will be the precursor of further "Selections". For it is most important that we should have the chance to

read and appreciate the thought of Christians of other Churches, and in other countries than our own. It was an excellent plan to make available in English samples of Roman Catholic thought both from this country and from the Continent. For it is unlikely in these days that many of us can afford the time or the money to peruse the many learned journals in which most of these articles were originally carried.

Selection I opens with an admirable Introduction declaring its purpose, and posing the pressing problem of our day, the compartmentalization of knowledge, and claiming that the Christian faith has been given by its place both in, and yet outside of, history a unique contribution to make to the reconciliation of the sciences.

The essays that follow will clearly vary in their appeal to different readers. Suffice it to say that all are on a high level of thought and scholarship. The idiom of some of the writing is wholly unfamiliar to us, and occasionally the subject-matter, as in the essay on Nuer Religion, is remote. In this country it is probable that the article called "God is our Mother" and the apologia for the Dogma of the Assumption will be among the less interesting contributions. The collection opens, however, with a paper on the Origin of Man, which is a good study of Evolutionary questions and evidences. Then, as in much Roman Catholic writing to-day, there are papers on the impact of religious symbols on the subconscious—revealing a preoccupation with psychological problems.

In the second part of the book there are three very interesting articles on biblical themes: first, there is a piece of soundly reasoned exposition on the miracle in Joshua 10: what really happened when the sun was said to stand still, that the Israelites might prolong their victory? A very sensible solution is given on the basis of "The Darkness theory": the stopping of the sun was a phenomenon implied in the hailstorm. Then there is an excellent discussion of Jeremiah, Pacifist or Fifth-columnist? We are made to sympathize with the position of the man forced to choose between his people then in the wrong, and the national enemy then in the right—a position intimately known in our day to many of our continental brethren.

The third and most important contribution is an exchange of letters between Adolf Harnack and Erik Peterson; the correspondence took place in 1928, but was first published in 1951. The exchange is concerned with the nature of the Church in Protestant thought, and is prophetic of the difficulties that were so soon to arise in Germany. The new bibliolatry which is the essence of neo-Protestantism, it is agreed, reduces itself to a "moral message with no binding force". From this point the correspondents go on to raise the most pressing problem of Authority.

The book ends on an eschatological note with a discussion of the nature of Anti-Christ and his reign. Altogether it is an excellent book, giving us an insight we should certainly otherwise miss: and it is beautifully printed and produced.

K.E.S., Birmingham. Ronald Lunt.

THE POLISH NATIONAL CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA AND POLAND. By Theodore Andrews. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The great European immigration to America in the nineteenth century raised many problems for the Roman Catholic Church in that land. Not the least of these was the task of accommodating national groups of widely different background to an ecclesiastical system entirely dominated by the Irish. The belligerent Americanism of the Irish-born prelates could make no allowance for the cultural aspirations of the non-English speaking minorities in the Church, and as a result there was widespread discontent and friction. In the 1890s a strong movement for autonomy among German-Americans threatened the unity of the Roman Church, and there was much disaffection among the Italians and Czechs.

Among the Polish communities in industrial centres, however, there arose the bitterest resentment to ecclesiastical regimentation. Beginning in 1895, separatist movements occurred in a number of parishes, and these gradually coalesced with a group headed by Francis Hodur, an able and energetic Polish priest of Scranton, Pennsylvania. The grounds of the schism are indicated by the demands in its original program—that the Polish people be in control of all churches built and maintained by them, and that they have the right to administer their own churches and choose their own priests. In 1904 the independent Polish National Catholic Church was organized by a synod of 147 clerical and lay delegates, and in 1907 Father Hodur received episcopal consecration from the Old Catholic bishops of Holland.

To-day the Polish Church consists of four dioceses in the north-eastern section of the United States, and numbers 250,000 adherents grouped in 136 parishes. In his brief but useful account of the Church, Dr Andrews describes the way in which clergy and laity co-operate in its government and administration, and finds the reason for its growth in its wholehearted acceptance of the ideal of "a special Polish faith". Undoubtedly, it has provided Polish Americans with a means of expressing their strong and self-conscious nationalism; an attempt was even made to plant the new Church in the homeland itself.

The Polish Church affirms its unity with the ancient undivided Church by its acceptance of the creeds, of the Apostolic ministry, and of a Catholic liturgy (a slightly modified vernacular form of the Roman Mass). Unfortunately, its distinctive confession of faith, formulated by Bishop Hodur, leaves much to be desired; the doctrinal definitions, if not actually heretical, are highly eccentric. But Dr Andrews points out that there has been no deliberate intention to depart from the faith of the historic creeds, and the American Episcopal Church, in accepting intercommunion with the Polish Church in 1940, seems to have found reassurance in the maxim *lex orandi, lex credendi*.

As citizens of Polish background become fully absorbed into the larger American community, their Church will be faced with the need for considerable reorientation. But as proved by the history of

other American Churches originally identified with national groups—the Episcopal, the Lutheran, the Dutch Reformed—this crisis of transition need not prove fatal. One may hazard the guess that as emphasis on the Polish heritage diminishes, this Church will move toward a fuller measure of unity with the Anglican Church in America.

Robert S. Bosher.

General Theological Seminary,
New York.

World Faith. By Ruth Cranston. Skeffington. 10s. 6d.

Amy Carmichael of Dohnavur. By Frank Houghton. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The author of *World Faith* has undertaken the difficult task of giving an unbiased account of Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese traditional wisdom, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and then distilling from them all that is best in all of them. She has also limited herself to 238 pages. One would imagine that there are two possible ways of tackling such a task: one should either take these religions at their own estimate of themselves, or adopt a critical attitude towards all of them. Ruth Cranston has followed the latter course—a far more difficult one, as it requires a critical knowledge of the origins of these various religions. She seems to have a sincere conviction that the oriental religions have often been misrepresented to Westerners—which is true enough—and also a belief that all these religions began with the simple, humanistic teaching of some great religious genius, and that all supernatural tendencies are later accretions. It cannot, however, be said that she seems well equipped for her task. Her chapter on Judaism is full of inaccuracies: e.g. she accepts the statement of the Chronicler and the author of Daniel that Jehoiakim was carried away captive by the Babylonians (p. 120); she confuses the Syrians with the Assyrians on p. 113; and she believes that Genesis I was written by D (p. 127). Her version of Christianity is entirely distorted by her Harnackian conviction that Jesus taught "a religion of simple love of God and service to fellow-men" (p. 176), and that the "doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of the Incarnation, transubstantiation, purgatory, heaven, and future rewards" are later additions (p. 177). In her desire to equate Christianity and Hinduism she interprets "I and the Father are one" in terms of Hindu monism, assuming that Jesus also meant "all men and the Father are substantially one". On the other hand, she accepts the Fourth Gospel as a source for the exact words of Jesus on a par with the Synoptics, since she often quotes our Lord's words from it to prove her points. Finally, her last chapter, where the "World Faith" is set forth, only takes up twelve pages. This is not surprising, as the "World Faith" turns out to have remarkably little content. Throughout the book, the notion of a personal God is deprecated, but at least in the chapter on Hinduism she does leave us with the Hindu pantheistic God. In the World Faith, however, God disappears altogether, and we are left with

"the creative power of man. . . . Man's ability to rise to a godlike state" (p. 233). Perhaps the chief significance of this book for Christians is that it represents the sort of attempt at a syncretism of all religions which is becoming very popular in Indian government circles to-day (witness the preaching of India's Vice-President, Dr Radhakrishnan). But even the keenest champion of a world faith might quail at the extraordinarily feeble specimen of it commended in this book. It would not convert a hen.

Perhaps the most satisfactory reply to Ruth Cranston's attempt to dispense with a personal God is the life of Amy Carmichael. Amy Carmichael is famous for the great work which she founded in Dohnavur in the Tirunelveli District of Madras Presidency, and which consisted in rescuing Hindu children destined by their parents to a life of prostitution or degradation in the service of the temples. But Bishop Houghton's biography makes it plain that she was also a woman of remarkable spiritual insight, who was deeply experienced in the life of prayer. Without belief in a personal God, Amy Carmichael's life makes no sense at all. Beside her profound self-surrender to our Lord, Ruth Cranston's synthetic religion of high-sounding principles seems a mere shadow. Bishop Houghton tells his story well; we gain a clear picture of the central figure and the community at Dohnavur. One is inevitably reminded of Florence Allshorn and the community at St Julian's. Both Amy Carmichael and Florence Allshorn were women of great Christian character and experience around whom there naturally grew up a community of friends and fellow-workers. They belong to the great central tradition of Christian sanctity; each left to her successors the perennial problem of continuing the community in the spirit of the founder without falling into slavish imitation.

The only jarring note in Bishop Houghton's book occurs on p. 257 where he tells us that "No one could be happy in it (the Dohnavur fellowship) who did not regard the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as divinely inspired and historically reliable." Most Christians could accept these terms, but he certainly means by them what is commonly called Fundamentalism, a sad limitation. But this biography is in fact a glowing testimony to the fact that all great Christians, whatever their background and environment, stand in the same tradition ultimately, and witness to the same experience of God in Christ.

ANTHONY HANSON.

DORNAKAL.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY REUNION? By C. B. Moss. S.P.C.K. 6s. 6d.
PROBLÈMES DE L'UNITÉ CHRÉTIENNE. By Roger Aubert. Editions de Chevetogne. 210 frs.

Dr Moss endeavours to reply to *Problems of Reunion* by the Bishop of Derby, but the "heads I win, tails you lose" attitude which he displays hardly commends his book as a serious contribution to the discussion of reunion. The now obsolete Methodist "connexion"

is revived to describe all groups of Christians separated from episcopacy, ostensibly "because it seems to be the word least likely to give offence". In Scotland the Episcopalians alone can claim to be a true Church, while the Church of Scotland is only a "connexion". Similarly, German Lutherans are a "connexion", because they owe their origin to an individual, Luther, whereas Swedish Lutherans were only influenced by Luther and are, therefore, a Church.

And what are we to make of this? "Reunion with foreigners is easier than with our own countrymen . . . Besides, reunion with one's own countrymen raises difficult questions of discipline, which hardly exist in the case of foreigners . . . Therefore reunion with Churches in other lands must precede, both in time and in importance, reunion with our separate fellow-Christians at home."

The view that schisms are *within* the Church is caricatured and dismissed with ridicule. The only course which Methodists, for instance, can adopt is "to recognize the unique position of the English (or Welsh or Scottish) Church as the Catholic Church of the country". To this is added a footnote: "The Methodist membership is in some countries much larger than ours: the above suggestions are not intended to be practical."

This last remark is almost the only indication that the author is aware of the existence of large Christian communities beyond the bounds of Europe and America. Presumably the Queen of Tonga and her subjects and the hill tribes of Assam, both entirely Christian communities who have known no other Church save that of the non-episcopal missionaries who brought them the Gospel, must style themselves "connexionists" rather than "Churchmen", until they submit to terms dictated by the Anglican Communion. One is left wondering whether the author cares, so long as he can enjoy intercommunion with the Old Catholics and, in a rather more condescending manner, with the Scandinavian Churches. He aspires after union with the Orthodox, "not to satisfy ourselves . . . but to convince our neighbours", while his opposition to Rome is only equalled by his disapproval of Geneva.

M. Aubert's introduction to the Ecumenical Movement, though true to the Roman position, rings very different in tone. This stirring of the Spirit has evidently not left Rome unmoved, and it is encouraging to read that "the Roman authorities adopt an attitude less rigid than in the past". Stress is laid in the opening chapter on the value of certain non-Roman insights. Though it is not conceded that these are absent from the full-orbed faith of the Roman Church, it is readily admitted that they have not always received their proper recognition there and that "the return of those who have separated from us would bring . . . spiritual enrichment in the understanding of dogma and the practice of the Christian virtues".

The brief sketches which follow of the non-Roman Churches are both sympathetic and fair. There is only one lapse in the chapter on the Anglican Communion, when Dr Henson, "Bishop of Durham until his death in 1947(!)", is bracketed with Dr Barnes as an expounder of "purely rationalist theses".

The last chapter, a rapid survey of the Ecumenical Movement, ends on a note of assurance of interest and hope for the future. But what more? There are several confessions of blunders on the part of the Western ecclesiastical authorities in past centuries which were among the causes of schism. One could hardly expect also a radical examination of the reasons why those in separation to-day are unwilling to return at once to the fold. The generally discerning and appreciative review of the Lund Conference by R. P. C. Dumont, O.P., which appears as an appendix, is in the same vein and concludes with a somewhat complacent rejection of any hope that there will occur "positive results to-day or to-morrow". One might describe this book as the extending of an olive branch: its significance lies in the fact that it is an engaging appeal to fellow-Romans to extend it too. Perhaps the lack we have noted of a sense of urgency in face of the present situation is due to the fact that both these authors, like Dr Moss, appear to have an horizon largely limited by the Western world. The "Younger Churches" receive scant attention apart from a joke quoted in a footnote (again, mark the position of the reference) about their being "les enfants terribles de l'oecuménisme". Some might wish to cherish this sobriquet.

T. S. Garrett.

Tirumaraiyur.

SHORTER NOTICES

Fishers of Men. By Peter Green. Mowbray. 5s.

A Man Approved. By Leo Trese. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

It is on record in the Bishop of Chichester's *Life* of Randall Davidson that, along with Bishop Gore, Canon Peter Green regarded the project of a national mission in 1916 with extreme pessimism; he is quoted as holding the view that the influence of the clergy on the community was nil. This small book is the fruit of quite an entirely contrasted spirit and attitude by the same Canon now operative over many years, the explanation being that while the National Mission "violated every sound principle of evangelism", parochial missions, wherever they have been adequately officered, have never failed to produce a lesser or greater spiritual harvest. Such is the thesis and here is the evidence—of personal conversions, of re-invigorated corporate life, of firmer hold on theological truth, of added zeal in the cause of missions overseas. Here too, so far as the printed page can function, are made plain the sound principles and their parochial application, while an additional recommendation of a valuable little handbook is the instruction on the long-term "follow-up". Few are the parishes which would not benefit by an injection into the normal routine of only a tincture of the passion and the wisdom which so evidently underlies this essay in evangelism.

Canon Peter Green's brochure will serve primarily the Anglican priest or layman who means business; should either light upon Father Trese's Retreat Addresses he will probably find it more super-

ficially interesting reading—and then, unless he be of the extreme Romanistic school, become conscious of a sense of depression. The interest of these nineteen talks is easily explicable—the themes selected, the fresh and breezy diction, the flashlights upon subsidiary characteristics of American Catholicism, the frank autobiographical confessions. The depression is induced by the exceeding strangeness of so much of this territory to the Anglican *voyageur* who becomes increasingly aware of the gulf which separates the Roman and non-Roman versions of the Gospel of God in Christ and, therefore, of how remote are any prospects of *rapprochement* and reunion. For the gap does not narrow but widens with the passing of the centuries. A reader, for instance, of the eighteenth address, "Queen of the Clergy", remembering too that this year will witness vast acclamations of the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, will perhaps fall into a depression which no amount of reading of early church history will suffice to cure. Here is Tridentine sacerdotalism in popular dress; the effect is in parts captivating, attractive and provocative of emulation; yet depressing in its suggestion and evidence that behind and beneath there is something other than the religion of the New Testament—a credulity, a cult and a system which may be Roman and Catholic and Holy but not Apostolic. And who or what shall bridge that gulf?

BRITFORD. W. G. ADDISON.

AN ADVENTURE IN DISCIPLESHIP. By Roger Lloyd. Longmans. 4s.

Can any good thing come out of a financial conference? This booklet unveils a moving of the Holy Spirit which began at such a conference in 1942 and has been kept secret until now.

It is the story of one of the cell movements that are a feature of church life to-day. It is known as "Servants of Christ the King" (S.C.K.), and has nothing to do with raising money, having but the minimum of organization necessary to keep the widely scattered branches in touch with one another. Each cell or branch has three to twelve members, all laity or all clergy, never mixed. Every branch has a priest adviser whose approval of the unanimous decision of all the members of a branch must be had before any work can be undertaken. With this double check on human nature's capacity for self-deception, S.C.K. believes it is an instrument used by God the Holy Spirit. Unanimous decisions are arrived at because each meeting is begun with a time of complete corporate silence in waiting upon God and then each member in turn has his say in the discussion without fear of interruption from the others.

The work the branches feel called upon to do varies from a transformation of a Rural Deanery through a large number of its clergy forming a branch, to quite humble parochial chores or even the service of one person or family in distress. Stress is laid on the spirit of love in which any work is undertaken, rather than on the magnitude or glamour of the task. There is a yearly conference open

to all members, which many who have attended say is a revelation of what true Christian living can be.

It is strange that those who had the insight to plan and make S.C.K. a reality were surprised that they were led against their early judgment to see that evangelism must really begin with the converted before we are in a position to make large-scale efforts among the unconverted, and also that most branches would be formed on a parochial basis. Such willingness to be guided seems to augur well for the integrity of the movement.

The Bishop of Ely is their Visitor and has written a preface.

It is to be hoped that S.C.K. will be greatly helped by the publication of this booklet, as it is vitally necessary that the renewed interest in Liturgy should be balanced by an increase of private prayer, intense fellowship, and costing personal commitment.

NORTHOLT PARK. IAN R. CARRICK, O.G.S.

Corrections. (1) There was a most unfortunate printing error in the January number of THEOLOGY. On p. 9, line 18 from bottom, "never be more than" should of course have read "never be no more than".

(2) With reference to p. 39 in the same number, our reviewer has come to the penitent stool with the confession that Dr B. J. Kidd's Christian name was not "Benjamin" but "Beresford"!

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: E. G. Lee, *Christianity and the New Situation* (12s. 6d.).

A. AND C. BLACK: J. R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (25s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Père Gardeil, O.P., *The Holy Spirit in Christian Life* (9s. 6d.); Conrad Pepler, O.P., *The Basis of the Mysticism of St Thomas* (2s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Maurice Barnett, *The Living Flame* (15s.).

GOLLANCZ: Victor Gollancz, *More for Timothy* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Edgar Primrose Dickie, *God is Light* (17s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: F. Davidson, A. M. Stibbs, and E. F. Kevan (Editors), *The New Bible Commentary* (35s.).

METHUEN: S. C. Gayford, *Sacrifice and Priesthood, Jewish and Christian* (10s. 6d.). [The original edition was reviewed by H. L. Pass in THEOLOGY, December 1925, pp. 348 ff.]

MOWBRAY: E. R. Fairweather and R. F. Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion* (with a foreword by the Bishop of Durham) (12s. 6d.).

NISBET: John Mackay, *God's Order* (12s. 6d.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): *Universales Christentum* (*Eine Heilige Kirche*, 1953/54, Heft I) (D.M. 6.80).

S.C.M. PRESS: R. R. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (8s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher